

Remarks

The Office Action mailed April 2, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof. Applicants and the undersigned wish to express their appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesies he extended during a telephone interview that occurred on July 15, 2004. During the interview, the Office Action dated April 2, 2004 was discussed. More specifically, the undersigned pointed out to the Examiner at least some of the differences between the present application and Joseph (U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2001/0034690), a reference cited in the Office Action under Section 102.

For example, the undersigned noted that the prior Office Action dated September 15, 2003, which cited to Joseph as a combined Section 103 reference, acknowledged that Joseph failed to teach certain recitations included within the presently pending independent claims.

The undersigned also argued that Joseph does not describe or teach prompting the customer to provide information, and receiving information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information; nor does Joseph describe or teach generating at least one document using the modified customer provided information and the customer selected piece of equipment wherein the at least one document includes terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor, and posting the generated document such that the customer and the lessor can view the document and document data, document data is information relating to the generation of the document including historical drafts of the document, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates.

The undersigned further argued that Joseph does not describe or suggest tracking tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated document including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated document, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.

Although no agreement was reached with respect to the patentability of the claims in the present case, the Examiner advised that he would fully consider Applicants' arguments along

with the Amendment to be filed. The Examiner and the undersigned further agreed that, if the Examiner decided to issue another Office Action in this matter and not a Notice of Allowance, the Examiner would contact the undersigned before issuing the Office Action so that another interview could be scheduled. The foregoing Amendment has been made in consequence of the Examiner Interview.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the present patent application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-70 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-70 stand rejected.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a), a one month extension of time is submitted herewith to extend the due date of the response to the Office Action dated April 2, 2004, for the above-identified patent application from July 2, 2004, through and including August 2, 2004. In accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a)(3), authorization to charge a deposit account in the amount of \$110.00 to cover this extension of time request also is submitted herewith.

The rejection of Claims 1-70 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Joseph (U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2001/0034690) is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Joseph does not describe or suggest the claimed invention. As discussed below, there are several differences between Joseph and the present invention. In fact, the prior Office Action dated September 15, 2003 acknowledged on page 3 that "Joseph fails to teach an inventive concept of a database for storing information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and if the equipment is currently being leased the terms of the lease, matching the customer provided information with the equipment information stored within the database by applying predetermined search rules, receiving information entered by a lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating a document."

Applicants also respectfully submit that Joseph does not describe or suggest a method for operating a computer to facilitate a lease transaction between a lessor and a customer that includes prompting the customer to provide information required to generate at least one document for a selected lease transaction type wherein the customer provided information

includes criteria of the equipment and additional lease requirements, and receiving information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating the at least one document.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Joseph does not describe or suggest generating the at least one document using the modified customer provided information and the customer selected piece of equipment wherein the at least one document includes terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor, and posting the generated document such that the customer and the lessor can view the document and document data, document data is information relating to the generation of the document including historical drafts of the document, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Joseph does not describe or suggest tracking tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated document including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated document, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.

Applicants also submit that Joseph does not describe or suggest a system for facilitating a lease transaction for an aircraft engine. In fact, Joseph fails to describe, teach or even mention aircraft engines in anyway. Moreover, the Office Action fails to address this aspect of the present claims.

Joseph describes a method for facilitating transfer of automobile leases (see page 1, paragraph 6). The method involves providing a website which displays a menu giving a visitor an option of either creating a record including details of the visitor and of a leased automobile whose lease the visitor intends to assign, or viewing a list of records, each record including a description of a leased automobile and an owner thereof (see page 1, paragraph 6). If the visitor intends to create a record, the visitor is directed to a page at the website where the visitor can input information pertaining to a leased automobile and information to enable another visitor to the website to contact the visitor (see page 1, paragraph 6). Such information may include the visitor's city, state, and e-mail, the automobile's make, model, year, color, number of doors, and

mileage, miles allowed on lease, monthly lease payment, months remaining on lease, and down payment required to acquire the lease, if any (see page 2, paragraph 25). The record created by the visitor is stored in a database (see page 1, paragraph 6). If the visitor intends to view a record or records, the visitor is directed to a page at the website where the visitor can view at least one record of a leased automobile (see page 1, paragraph 6). The method enables the visitor to delete or modify an existing vehicle lease record only if the existing vehicle lease record is associated with the listing visitor (see page 2, paragraphs 8, 10).

Claim 1 recites a method for operating a computer to facilitate a lease transaction between a lessor and a customer, the method includes “providing a database for storing information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and, if the equipment is currently being leased, the terms of the lease...prompting the customer to select a lease transaction type for a specific type of equipment to be leased...prompting the customer to provide information required to generate at least one document for the selected lease transaction type, the customer provided information includes criteria of the equipment and additional lease requirements...matching the customer provided information with the equipment information stored within the database by applying predetermined search rules...displaying search results including each piece of equipment matching the customer provided information...selecting by the customer a piece of equipment from the displayed search results...receiving information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating the at least one document...generating the at least one document using the modified customer provided information and the customer selected piece of equipment, the at least one document including terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor...posting the generated document such that the customer and the lessor can view the document and document data, document data is information relating to the generation of the document including historical drafts of the document, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates...and tracking tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated document including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated document, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.”

Joseph does not describe or suggest a method as recited in Claim 1. More specifically, Joseph does not describe or suggest a method for operating a computer to facilitate a lease transaction between a lessor and a customer that includes prompting the customer to provide information required to generate at least one document for a selected lease transaction type wherein the customer provided information includes criteria of the equipment and additional lease requirements, and receiving information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating the at least one document.

Moreover, Joseph does not describe or suggest generating the at least one document using the modified customer provided information and the customer selected piece of equipment wherein the at least one document includes terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor, and posting the generated document such that the customer and the lessor can view the document and document data including information relating to the generation of the document including historical drafts of the document, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates.

Furthermore, Joseph does not describe or suggest tracking tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated document including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated document, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.

In fact, the prior Office Action dated September 15, 2003 acknowledges that “Joseph fails to teach an inventive concept of a database for storing information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and if the equipment is currently being leased the terms of the lease, matching the customer provided information with the equipment information stored within the database by applying predetermined search rules, receiving information entered by a lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating a document.”

Rather, Joseph describes a system that is utilized by a lease owner (e.g., someone who has already leased a vehicle from a vehicle leasing company), who intends to assign the vehicle lease to another party referred to as a lease buyer. The lease owner either enters a record in the

system that includes a description of the leased automobile that the lease owner intends to assign, modifies an existing record, or deletes a record. The lease buyer can search the system to locate a vehicle matching certain parameters inputted by the lease buyer. Once the lease buyer locates a vehicle that he wishes to assume the lease of, the lease buyer can then contact the lease owner such that the parties can negotiate the terms of the of the lease assumption offline (page 3, paragraph 33).

Notably, Joseph does not describe or suggest prompting a customer to provide information required to generate at least one document for a selected lease transaction type wherein the customer provided information includes criteria of the equipment and additional lease requirements, and receiving information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating the at least one document. Although Joseph describes a lease owner who inputs information relating to a lease intended to be assigned and a lease buyer who inputs a vehicle description that is searched for, Joseph does not describe or suggest prompting a customer to provide information required to generate at least one document, and then receiving information entered by a lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating the at least one document. Joseph does not describe or suggest one party modifying information inputted by another party.

The Office Action asserts at page 3 that Joseph describes at paragraphs 0026-0027 “generating a document/term sheet using customer provided information”. However, Applicants submit that paragraphs 0026 and 0027 of Joseph actually describe a lease owner modifying a record of a leased vehicle. Joseph does not describe or teach generating at least one document using modified customer provided information and a customer selected piece of equipment wherein the at least one document includes terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor.

The Office Action also asserts at page 4 that Joseph describes at paragraphs 0040 and 0042-0043 “posting the generated document such that the customer and the lessor can view the document and document data is information relating to the generation of the document including historical drafts of the document, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates” and further asserts that Joseph describes at paragraphs 0046-0048 “tracking tasks to be performed,

dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated document including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated document, and meeting regarding the lease transaction”. Applicants respectfully traverse these assertions.

Rather, Applicants respectfully submit that paragraphs 0040 and 0042-0043 of Joseph describe inputting by the lease owner information describing a leased vehicle to be listed in the system for the purpose of assigning the lease, inputting by the lease owner information relating to the lease agreement between the lease owner and the leasing company, and inputting whether the lease owner wishes to purchase liability insurance for the leased vehicle. Joseph does not describe or suggest posting a generated document, a document that includes terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor, such that the customer and the lessor can view the document and document data, wherein document data is information relating to the generation of the document including historical drafts of the document, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates.

Moreover, paragraphs 0046-0048 of Joseph describe an edit seller data option which enables a lease owner/seller to edit his account information, a manage add option which enables a lease owner/seller to edit, delete or extend the amount of time that a lease record is shown on the system, and a liability insurance link. Joseph does not describe or suggest tracking tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of a generated document including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated document, and meeting regarding the lease transaction. In fact, Joseph does not even mention any of these recitations. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Joseph.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Joseph.

Claims 2-8 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 1 which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 2-8 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 2-8 are also patentable over Joseph.

In addition to the argument set forth above, Applicants further submit that dependent Claim 5 is patentable over Joseph. Claim 5 recites a method wherein selecting by the customer a piece of equipment from the displayed search results further comprises “automatically transmitting data relating to the piece of equipment selected by the customer to a technical project manager for the lessor, a fleet manager for the lessor, and a marketing executive for the lessor...prompting the technical project manager to submit comments to the marketing executive regarding the piece of equipment selected by the customer including feasibility of supplying the selected piece of equipment, lead times for supplying the selected piece of equipment, and cost estimates for additional technical requirements...and prompting the fleet manager to submit an allocation decision to the marketing executive regarding the piece of equipment selected by the customer.” Applicants respectfully submit that Joseph does not describe or suggest the recitations included in Claim 5. Accordingly, Applicants further submit that Claim 5 is patentable over Joseph.

Claim 9 recites a computer for facilitating a lease transaction between a lessor and a customer, the computer programmed to “store, in a database, information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and, if the equipment is currently being leased, the terms of the lease...prompt the customer to select a type of lease transaction for a specific type of equipment to be leased...prompt the customer to provide information required to generate at least one document for the selected lease transaction type, the customer provided information includes criteria of the equipment and additional lease requirements...match the customer provided information with the equipment information stored within the database by applying predetermined search rules...display search results including each piece of equipment matching the customer provided information...prompt the customer to select a piece of equipment from the displayed search results...receive information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating the at least one document...generate the at least one document using the modified customer provided information and the customer selected piece of equipment, the at least one document including terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor...post the generated document such that the customer and the lessor can view the document and document data, document data is information relating to the generation of the document including historical drafts of the document, each

author of the historical drafts, and modification dates...track tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated document including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated document, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.”

Joseph does not describe or suggest a computer as recited in Claim 9. More specifically, Joseph does not describe or suggest a computer for facilitating a lease transaction between a lessor and a customer that is programmed to prompt the customer to provide information required to generate at least one document for a selected lease transaction type, and receive information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating the at least one document.

Moreover, Joseph does not describe or suggest a computer programmed to generate the at least one document using the modified customer provided information and the customer selected piece of equipment wherein the document includes terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor, and post the generated document such that the customer and the lessor can view the document and document data including information relating to the generation of the document including historical drafts of the document, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates.

Furthermore, Joseph does not describe or suggest a computer programmed to track tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated document including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated document, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.

In fact, as indicated above, the prior Office Action dated September 15, 2003 acknowledges that “Joseph fails to teach an inventive concept of a database for storing information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and if the equipment is currently being leased the terms of the lease, matching the customer provided information with the equipment information stored within the database by

applying predetermined search rules, receiving information entered by a lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating a document.”

Rather, Joseph describes a system that is utilized by a lease owner (e.g., someone who has already leased a vehicle from a vehicle leasing company), who intends to assign the vehicle lease to another party referred to as a lease buyer. The lease owner either enters a record in the system that includes a description of the leased automobile that the lease owner intends to assign, modifies an existing record, or deletes a record. The lease buyer can search the system to locate a vehicle matching certain parameters inputted by the lease buyer. Once the lease buyer locates a vehicle that he wishes to assume the lease of, the lease buyer can then contact the lease owner such that the parties can negotiate the terms of the of the lease assumption offline (page 3, paragraph 33).

Notably, Joseph does not describe or suggest a computer programmed to prompt the customer to provide information required to generate at least one document for the selected lease transaction type, and receive information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating the at least one document. Although Joseph describes a lease owner who inputs information relating to a lease intended to be assigned and a lease buyer who inputs a vehicle description that is searched for, Joseph does not describe or suggest prompting a customer to provide information required to generate at least one document, and then receiving information entered by a lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating the at least one document.

The Office Action asserts at page 3 that Joseph describes at paragraphs 0026-0027 “generating a document/term sheet using customer provided information”. However, Applicants submit that paragraphs 0026 and 0027 of Joseph actually describe a lease owner modifying a record of a leased vehicle. Accordingly, Joseph does not describe or teach a computer programmed to generate the at least one document using the modified customer provided information and the customer selected piece of equipment wherein the document includes terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor.

The Office Action also asserts at page 4 that Joseph describes at paragraphs 0040 and 0042-0043 “posting the generated document such that the customer and the lessor can view the document and document data is information relating to the generation of the document including historical drafts of the document, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates” and further asserts that Joseph describes at paragraphs 0046-0048 “tracking tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated document including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated document, and meeting regarding the lease transaction”. Applicants respectfully traverse these assertions.

Rather, Applicants submit that paragraphs 0040 and 0042-0043 of Joseph describe inputting by the lease owner information describing a leased vehicle to be listed in the system for the purpose of assigning the lease, inputting by the lease owner information relating to the lease agreement between the lease owner and the leasing company, and inputting whether the lease owner wishes to purchase liability insurance for the leased vehicle. Joseph does not describe or suggest a computer programmed to post the generated document such that the customer and the lessor can view the document and document data including information relating to the generation of the document including historical drafts of the document, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates.

Moreover, paragraphs 0046-0048 of Joseph describe an edit seller data option which enables a lease owner/seller to edit his account information, a manage add option which enables a lease owner/seller to edit, delete or extend the amount of time that a lease record is shown on the system, and a liability insurance link. Joseph does not describe or suggest a computer programmed to track tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in the terms and conditions of the generated document including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated document, and meeting regarding the lease transaction. In fact, Joseph does not even mention any of these recitations. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 9 is patentable over Joseph.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 9 is submitted to be patentable over Joseph.

Claims 10-16 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 9 which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 10-16 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 9, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 10-16 are also patentable over Joseph.

Claim 17 recites a database for storing data relating to a lease transaction between a lessor and a customer that includes “a first set of data corresponding to an availability query submitted by the customer and related to a lease transaction, the first set of data including criteria for equipment to be leased and additional lease requirements...a second set of data corresponding to information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment, and if the equipment is being leased, the terms of the lease...a third set of data corresponding to predetermined search rules that are applied to match the first set of data with the equipment information in the second set of data...a fourth set of data corresponding to search results including each piece of equipment matching the customer provided information, wherein the customer is prompted to select a piece of equipment from search results...a fifth set of data corresponding to modifications of the first set of data that are made by the lessor...a sixth set of data corresponding to at least one document generated using the fifth set of data and the customer selected piece of equipment, the at least one document including terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor...a seventh set of data corresponding to the generated document that enables the customer and the lessor to view the document and document data, document data is information relating to the generation of the document including historical drafts of the document, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates...and an eighth set of data corresponding to tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated document including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated document, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.”

Joseph does not describe or suggest a database as recited in Claim 17. More specifically, Joseph does not describe or suggest a database for storing data relating to a lease transaction between a lessor and a customer that includes a first set of data corresponding to an availability query submitted by the customer and related to a lease transaction, and a fifth set of data

corresponding to modifications that are made by the lessor to the first set of data corresponding to the availability query.

Moreover, Joseph does not describe or suggest a database that includes a sixth set of data corresponding to at least one document generated and the customer selected piece of equipment wherein the at least one document includes terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor, and a seventh set of data corresponding to the generated document that enables the customer and the lessor to view the document and document data including information relating to the generation of the document including historical drafts of the document, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates.

Furthermore, Joseph does not describe or suggest a database that includes an eighth set of data corresponding to tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated document including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated document, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.

Rather, Joseph describes a method for facilitating transfer of automobile leases from a lease owner, who leased the vehicle from a leasing company, to a lease buyer. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 17 is patentable over Joseph.

Claims 18-20 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 17 which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 18-20 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 17, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 18-20 are also patentable over Joseph.

Claim 21 recites a system for generating lease documents between a lessor and a customer that includes a database having information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and, if the equipment is currently being leased, the terms of the lease, and a server configured to “prompt the customer to provide information required to generate a document for a selected lease transaction type, the customer

provided information includes criteria of an equipment and additional lease requirements...match the customer provided information with the equipment information by applying predetermined search rules...display search results including each piece of equipment matching the customer provided information...prompt the customer to select a piece of equipment from the displayed search results...prompt the lessor to select a type of document to be generated and to provide information required to generate the selected document type...receive information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating the document...generate the at least one document using the modified customer provided information and the customer selected piece of equipment, the at least one document including terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor...post the generated document such that the customer and the lessor can view the document and document data, document data is information relating to the generation of the document including historical drafts of the document, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates...and track tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated document including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated document, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.”

Joseph does not describe or suggest a system as recited in Claim 21. More specifically, Joseph does not describe or suggest a system for generating lease documents between a lessor and a customer that includes a server configured to prompt the customer to provide information required to generate a document for a selected lease transaction type including criteria of a piece of equipment and additional lease requirements, and receive information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating the document.

Moreover, Joseph does not describe or suggest a server configured to generate the at least one document using the modified customer provided information and the customer selected piece of equipment wherein the at least one document including terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor, and post the generated document such that the customer and the lessor can view the document and document data including information relating to the generation of the document

including historical drafts of the document, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates.

Furthermore, Joseph does not describe or suggest a server configured to track tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in the terms and conditions of the generated document including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated document, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.

Rather, Joseph describes a method for facilitating transfer of automobile leases from a lease owner, who leased the vehicle from a leasing company, to a lease buyer. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 21 is patentable over Joseph.

Claims 22-29 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 21 which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 22-29 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 21, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 22-29 are also patentable over Joseph.

Claim 30 recites a method for initiating a lease transaction between a lessor and a customer that includes “prompting the customer to select a type of lease transaction for a specific type of equipment to be leased...prompting the customer to provide information regarding equipment to be subject to the lease transaction, the customer provided information includes criteria of the equipment and additional lease requirements...prompting the customer to request generation of a term sheet for the lease transaction...matching the customer provided information with equipment information by applying predetermined search rules, the equipment information including specifications for a plurality of equipment and, if a piece of equipment is currently being leased, the terms of the lease...displaying search results including each piece of equipment matching the customer provided information...selecting by the customer a piece of equipment from the displayed search results...receiving information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating the term sheet...generating the term sheet using the modified customer provided information and the customer selected piece of equipment, the term sheet including terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer

for leasing the customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor...posting the generated term sheet such that the customer and the lessor can view the term sheet and document data, document data is information relating to the generation of the term sheet including historical drafts of the term sheet, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates...and tracking tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated term sheet including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the term sheet, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.”

Joseph does not describe or suggest a method as recited in Claim 30. More specifically, Joseph does not describe or suggest a method for initiating a lease transaction between a lessor and a customer that includes prompting the customer to provide information regarding equipment to be subject to the lease transaction, prompting the customer to request generation of a term sheet for the lease transaction, and receiving information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating the term sheet.

Moreover, Joseph does not describe or suggest generating the term sheet using the modified customer provided information and the customer selected piece of equipment wherein the term sheet includes terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor, and posting the generated term sheet such that the customer and the lessor can view the term sheet and document data including information relating to the generation of the term sheet including historical drafts of the term sheet, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates.

Furthermore, Joseph does not describe or suggest tracking tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated term sheet including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the term sheet, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.

Rather, Joseph describes a method for facilitating transfer of automobile leases from a lease owner, who leased the vehicle from a leasing company, to a lease buyer. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 30 is patentable over Joseph.

Applicants also submit that Joseph does not describe or suggest generating a term sheet that includes terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing a customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor. The Office Action asserts at page 3 that Joseph describes at paragraphs 0026-0027 “generating a document/term sheet using customer provided information”. However, paragraphs 0026 and 0027 of Joseph do not describe, teach, or even mention generating a term sheet as recited in Claim 30. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 30 is patentable over Joseph.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 30 is submitted to be patentable over Joseph.

Claims 31-37 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 30 which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 31-37 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 30, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 31-37 are also patentable over Joseph.

Claim 38 recites a method for initiating a lease transaction between a lessor and a customer that includes “providing a database for storing information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and, if the equipment is currently being leased, the terms of the lease...selecting, by the customer, from an electronic interface, a lease transaction type for a specific type of equipment to be leased...identifying, by the customer, from the electronic interface, information including criteria of equipment desired to be subject to the lease and additional lease requirements...requesting, by the customer, from the electronic interface, a term sheet for the selected lease type and identified equipment...matching the customer provided information with the equipment information by applying predetermined search rules...displaying search results including each piece of equipment matching the customer provided information...selecting by the customer a piece of equipment from the displayed search results...receiving information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating the term sheet...generating the term sheet using the modified customer provided information and the customer selected piece of equipment, the term sheet including terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor...posting the

generated term sheet such that the customer and the lessor can view the term sheet and document data, document data is information relating to the generation of the term sheet including historical drafts of the terms sheet, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates...tracking tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated term sheet including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated term sheet, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.”

Joseph does not describe or suggest a method as recited in Claim 38. More specifically, Joseph does not describe or suggest a method for initiating a lease transaction between a lessor and a customer that includes identifying by the customer from the electronic interface information including criteria of equipment desired to be subject to the lease and additional lease requirements, and receiving information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating the term sheet.

Moreover, Joseph does not describe or suggest generating a term sheet using the modified customer provided information and the customer selected piece of equipment wherein the term sheet includes terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor, and posting the generated term sheet such that the customer and the lessor can view the term sheet and document data including information relating to the generation of the term sheet including historical drafts of the terms sheet, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates.

Furthermore, Joseph does not describe or suggest tracking tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated term sheet including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated term sheet, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.

Rather, Joseph describes a method for facilitating transfer of automobile leases from a lease owner, who leased the vehicle from a leasing company, to a lease buyer. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 38 is patentable over Joseph.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 38 is submitted to be patentable over Joseph.

Claims 39-42 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 38 which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 39-42 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 38, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 39-42 are also patentable over Joseph.

Claim 43 recites an apparatus for facilitating a lease transaction between a lessor and a customer, the apparatus includes “means for storing information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and, if the equipment is currently being leased, the terms of the lease...means for prompting the customer to select a type of lease transaction for a specific type of equipment to be leased...means for prompting the customer to provide information regarding equipment to be subject to the lease transaction, the customer provided information including criteria of the equipment and additional lease requirements...means for prompting the customer to request generation of a term sheet for the lease transaction...means for matching the customer provided information with the equipment information by applying predetermined search rules...means for displaying search results including each piece of equipment matching the customer provided information...means for selecting by the customer a piece of equipment from the displayed search results...means for receiving information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating the term sheet...means for generating the term sheet using the modified customer provided information and the customer selected piece of equipment, the term sheet including terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor...means for posting the generated term sheet such that the customer and the lessor can view the term sheet and document data, document data is information relating to the generation of the term sheet including historical drafts of the terms sheet, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates...and means for tracking tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated term sheet including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated term sheet, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.”

Joseph does not describe or suggest an apparatus as recited in Claim 43. More specifically, Joseph does not describe or suggest an apparatus for facilitating a lease transaction between a lessor and a customer that includes means for prompting the customer to provide information regarding equipment to be subject to the lease transaction wherein the customer provided information includes criteria of the equipment and additional lease requirements, and means for receiving information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating a term sheet.

Moreover, Joseph does not describe or suggest means for generating a term sheet using the modified customer provided information and the customer selected piece of equipment wherein the term sheet includes terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected piece of equipment to the customer by the lessor, and means for posting the generated term sheet such that the customer and the lessor can view the term sheet and document data including information relating to the generation of the term sheet including historical drafts of the terms sheet, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates.

Furthermore, Joseph does not describe or suggest means for tracking tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated term sheet including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated term sheet, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.

Rather, Joseph describes a method for facilitating transfer of automobile leases from a lease owner, who leased the vehicle from a leasing company, to a lease buyer. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 43 is patentable over Joseph.

Claims 44-50 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 43 which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 44-50 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 43, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 44-50 are also patentable over Joseph.

Claim 51 recites a system for facilitating a lease transaction for aircraft between a lessor and a customer that includes a database having information relating to a plurality of aircrafts for lease including specifications for each aircraft and, if the aircraft is currently being leased, the terms of the lease, and a server configured to “prompt the customer to select a type of lease transaction for a specific type of aircraft to be leased...prompt the customer to provide information regarding aircraft desired to be subject to the lease transaction, the customer provided information includes criteria of the aircraft and additional lease requirements...prompt the customer to request generation of a term sheet for the lease transaction...match, based on a set of rules, the customer provided information with the aircraft information, the set of rules including at least one of countries in which aircraft can be leased, a tax based restriction on aircraft enforced in some of the countries, and whether the aircraft is newly manufactured...display search results including each aircraft matching the customer provided information...prompt the customer to select an aircraft from the displayed search results...receive information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating the term sheet...generate the term sheet using the modified customer provided information and the customer selected aircraft, the term sheet including terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected aircraft to the customer by the lessor...post the generated term sheet such that the customer and the lessor can view the term sheet and document data, document data is information relating to the generation of the term sheet including historical drafts of the term sheet, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates...and track tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated term sheet including at least one of inspecting the customer selected aircraft, signing the generated term sheet, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.”

Joseph does not describe or suggest a system as recited in Claim 51. More specifically, Joseph does not describe or suggest a system for facilitating a lease transaction for an aircraft between a lessor and a customer that includes a server configured to prompt the customer to provide information regarding the aircraft desired to be subject to the lease transaction wherein the customer provided information includes criteria of the aircraft and additional lease requirements, and receive information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating a term sheet.

Moreover, Joseph does not describe or suggest a server configured to generate a term sheet using the modified customer provided information and the customer selected aircraft wherein the term sheet includes terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected aircraft to the customer by the lessor, and post the generated term sheet such that the customer and the lessor can view the term sheet and document data including information relating to the generation of the term sheet including historical drafts of the term sheet, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates.

Furthermore, Joseph does not describe or suggest a server configured to track tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated term sheet including at least one of inspecting the customer selected aircraft, signing the generated term sheet, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.

Applicants also submit that Joseph does not describe or suggest a system for facilitating a lease transaction for an aircraft. In fact, Joseph fails to describe, teach or even mention aircrafts in any way. Moreover, the Office Action fails to address this aspect of the present claims.

Rather, Joseph describes a method for facilitating transfer of automobile leases from a lease owner, who leased the automobile from a leasing company, to a lease buyer. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 51 is patentable over Joseph.

Claims 52-57 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 51 which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 52-57 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 51, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 52-57 are also patentable over Joseph.

Claim 58 recites a system for facilitating a lease transaction for an aircraft engine between a lessor and a customer that includes a database having information for aircraft engines for lease including specifications for each aircraft engine and, if the aircraft engine is currently being leased, the terms of the lease, and a server configured to “prompt the customer to select a type of lease transaction for a specific type of aircraft engine to be leased...prompt the customer

to provide information regarding an aircraft engine desired to be subject to the lease transaction wherein the customer provided information includes criteria of the aircraft engine and additional lease requirements...prompt the customer to request generation of a term sheet for the lease transaction...match the customer provided information with the aircraft engine information stored within the database by applying predetermined search rules...display search results including each aircraft engine matching the customer provided information...prompt the customer to select an aircraft engine from the displayed search results...receive information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information to generate the term sheet...generate the term sheet using the modified customer provided information and the customer selected aircraft engine, the term sheet including terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected aircraft engine to the customer by the lessor...post the generated term sheet such that the customer and the lessor can view the term sheet and document data including historical drafts of the term sheet, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates...track tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated term sheet including at least one of inspecting the customer selected aircraft, signing the generated term sheet, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.”

Joseph does not describe or suggest a system as recited in Claim 58. More specifically, Joseph does not describe or suggest a system for facilitating a lease transaction for an aircraft engine between a lessor and a customer that includes a server configured to prompt the customer to provide information regarding an aircraft engine desired to be subject to the lease transaction wherein the customer provided information includes criteria of the aircraft engine and additional lease requirements, and receive information entered by the lessor to modify the customer provided information to generate the term sheet.

Moreover, Joseph does not describe or suggest a server configured to generate the term sheet using the modified customer provided information and the customer selected aircraft engine wherein the term sheet includes terms and conditions proposed by the lessor to the customer for leasing the customer selected aircraft engine to the customer by the lessor, and post the generated term sheet such that the customer and the lessor can view the term sheet and

document data including historical drafts of the term sheet, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates.

Furthermore, Joseph does not describe or suggest a server configured to track tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated term sheet including at least one of inspecting the customer selected aircraft, signing the generated term sheet, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.

Applicants respectfully submit that Joseph does not describe or suggest a system for facilitating a lease transaction for an aircraft engine. In fact, Joseph fails to describe, teach or even mention aircraft engines in any way. Moreover, the Office Action fails to address this aspect of the present claims.

Rather, Joseph describes a method for facilitating transfer of automobile leases from a lease owner, who leased the automobile from a leasing company, to a lease buyer. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 58 is patentable over Joseph.

Claims 59-64 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 58 which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 59-64 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 58, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 59-64 are also patentable over Joseph.

Claim 65 recites a computer-readable medium for facilitating a lease transaction between a lessor and a customer, the computer-readable medium includes “a record of customer submitted availability queries, the customer submitted availability queries include criteria of equipment to be leased and additional lease requirements...a plurality of rules for matching equipment information to the customer submitted availability queries, the equipment information including specifications for each piece of equipment, and if the equipment is currently being leased, the terms of the lease...a first record of results from applying the matching rules to the customer submitted availability queries...a record of a piece of equipment selected by the customer from the first record of results...a second record of results from information entered by

the lessor to modify the customer submitted availability queries...a record of a document generated from the modified customer submitted availability queries and the record of a piece of equipment selected by the customer including historical drafts of the document, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates...a record of tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated document including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated document, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.”

Joseph does not describe or suggest a computer-readable medium as recited in Claim 65. More specifically, Joseph does not describe or suggest a computer-readable medium for facilitating a lease transaction between a lessor and a customer that includes a record of customer submitted availability queries that include criteria of equipment to be leased and additional lease requirements, a plurality of rules for matching equipment information to the customer submitted availability queries, and a second record of results from information entered by the lessor to modify the customer submitted availability queries.

Moreover, Joseph does not describe or suggest a computer-readable medium that includes a record of a document generated from the modified customer submitted availability queries and the record of a piece of equipment selected by the customer including historical drafts of the document, each author of the historical drafts, and modification dates.

Furthermore, Joseph does not describe or suggest computer-readable medium that includes a record of tasks to be performed, dates for performance, and parties responsible for performing the tasks as set forth in terms and conditions of the generated document including at least one of inspecting the customer selected piece of equipment, signing the generated document, and meeting regarding the lease transaction.


Rather, Joseph describes a method for facilitating transfer of automobile leases from a lease owner, who leased the automobile from a leasing company, to a lease buyer. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 65 is patentable over Joseph.

Claims 66-70 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 65 which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 66-70 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 65, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 66-70 are also patentable over Joseph.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-70 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Daniel M. Fitzgerald", is written over a horizontal line.

Daniel M. Fitzgerald
Registration No. 38,880
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070